REMARKS

1.   Summary of Office Action and Advisory Action

In the Office Action mailed November 2, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 13, and 37 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Charles P. Pfleeger, "Security in Computing," ISBN 013374866, 1996 (Pfleeger). The Examiner rejected claims 1-8, 12-14, 21, 24, 26, 31-32, 34, 36-38, 43, and 46-49 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,484,261 (Wiegel). The Examiner rejected claims 9-11, 27, 33, 35, 42, and 44-45 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiegel in view of Official Notice. The Examiner indicated that a Double Patenting Rejection of claims 1-28 and 31-45 over claims in U.S. Patent Application No. 09/728,558 will be invalidated upon U.S. Patent Application No. 09/728,558 going abandoned.

2.   Amendments and Pending Claims

Applicant has amended claims 1, 13, 30, and 37-38, has cancelled claims 46-49, and has added new claims 50-53. Presently pending in this application are claims 1-21, 24, 26-28, 30-38, 42-45, and 50-53, of which claims 1, 13, 37, and 38 are independent.

Applicant has amended the specification. Applicant has replaced the paragraph starting at page 6, line 7, with an amended paragraph. Original claim 40 provides support for this amendment. Applicant has added a new paragraph to follow the paragraph ending on page 9, line 19. Support for this amendment is located at original claims 21 and 38-40, and the specification at page 6, lines 8-9.

3.   Supplemental Application Data Sheet

Applicant submitted a supplemental Application Data Sheet on August 8, 2005 to change the Attorney Docket Number, but there is no record on the Patent Application Information

- 17 -

Retrieval (PAIR) system showing that this supplemental Application Data Sheet was received by the U.S. Patent Office. Applicant now again submits a supplemental Application Data Sheet to change the Attorney Docket Number from 1589a to 1769.

4.   Response to Examiner's Claim Rejections

a.   Wiegel Reference

The Examiner rejected claims 1-8, 12-14, 21, 24, 26, 31-32, 34, 36-38, 43, and 46-49 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Wiegel. Under M.P.E.P. § 2131, a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.

Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 13, 37, and 38 to include limitations from cancelled claims 46, 47, 48, and 49, respectively. As amended, independent claims 1, 13, and 37-38 are directed towards provisioning an interconnection system with access-control logic (or access-control rules), on demand, from an external entity connected to the interconnection system. Claims 1, 13, and 37-38 clearly distinguish over Wiegel because Wiegel fails to disclose or suggest all of the limitations of these claims.

With respect to amended claim 1, at a minimum, for instance, Wiegel fails to teach or suggest an entity external to the interconnection system "receiving from the interconnection system *a signal indicating detection* of an attempted inter-node communication involving the at least one service component," and *"in response to receiving the signal,* the external entity providing at least a portion of the access control logic to the interconnection system." (Emphasis added).

With respect to amended claims 13 and 37, at a minimum, for instance Wiegel fails to teach or suggest (i) at the interconnection system, detecting an attempted inter-node

- 18 -

communication between service components (or between application components) and responsively sending the external entity *a signal indicating detection* of the attempted inter-node communication, and (ii) at the external entity, *receiving the signal* indicating detection of the attempted inter-node communication *and responsively providing* at least a portion of the access-control logic (or the access-control rules) to the interconnection system. (Emphasis added).

With respect to amended claim 38, at a minimum, for instance Wiegel fails to teach or suggest (i) an entity, external to the interconnection system, communicatively linked with the interconnection system, (ii) wherein the external entity includes access-control logic indicating allowed inter-node communications between application components, (iii) wherein the interconnection system detects an attempted inter-node communication between application components and responsively sends to the external entity *a signal indicating detection* of the attempted inter-node communication, and (iv) wherein the external entity *receives the signal* and *responsively provides* the access-control logic to the interconnection system. (Emphasis added).

In rejecting claims 46-49, limitations of which are now recited in claims 1, 13, and 37-38, the Examiner indicated that (i) Wiegel teaches a policy translation agent responsible for translating or converting policies as represented in a knowledge base into a form that can be understood by a firewall, a router, or a switch, and (ii) Weigel's implementation is associated with session operations, e.g., evaluates session requests. The Examiner also indicated Wiegel's invention deals with session operations, and as a result, there must be a session manager entity that manages operations associated with the sessions. (Office Action mailed November 2, 2005, page 4, lines 18-20).

At best, Wiegel teaches (i) the policy translation agent translates or converts polices represented in the knowledge base into a form that can be understood by a firewall, (ii) a session

- 19 -

McDONNELL BOEHNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP
300 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE
CHICAGO ILLINOIS 60606

PAGE 24/31 * RCVD AT 3/7/2006 5:09:52 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-2/10 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:+13129130002 * DURATION (mm-ss):08-02

request identifies a network packet that does not belong to an existing session, (iii) a firewall evaluates parameters of a session request against the session controls specified by the administrator, and (iv) to establish a security policy applicable to a network or one of its nodes, the user can drag network security policies and drop them onto each icon in the network tree. (See, e.g., col. 11, lines 32, col. 9, lines 58-60, col. 10, lines 8-10, col. 15, lines 38-41).

However, Wiegel fails to teach or suggest an entity external to the interconnection system receiving from the interconnection system *a signal indicating detection* of an attempted inter-node communication involving the at least one service component, and *in response to receiving the signal*, the external entity providing at least a portion of the access control logic to the interconnection system, as recited in claims 1, 13, and 37-38.

Because Wiegel does not teach or suggest each and every element of claims 1, 13, and 37-38, Wiegel fails to anticipate claims 1, 13, and 37-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Further, claims 2-12, 14-21, 24, 26-28, 30-36, 42-45, and 50-53 depend from either of claims 1, 13, 37, or 38, and thus are allowable for at least the reason that they depend from an allowable claim.

b. Pfleeger Reference

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 13, and 37 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Pfleeger. Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 13, and 37 to include limitations from cancelled claims 46, 47, and 48, respectively. As amended, independent claims 1, 13, and 37 are directed towards provisioning an interconnection system with access-control logic (or access control rules), on demand, from an external entity connected to the interconnection system. Claims 1, 13, and 37 clearly distinguish over Pfleeger because Pfleeger fails to disclose or suggest all of the limitations of these claims.

- 20 -

With respect to amended claim 1, at a minimum, for instance, Pfleeger fails to teach or suggest an entity external to the interconnection system "receiving from the interconnection system *a signal indicating detection* of an attempted inter-node communication involving the at least one service component," and *"in response to receiving the signal,* the external entity providing at least a portion of the access control logic to the interconnection system." (Emphasis added).

With respect to amended claims 13 and 37, at a minimum, for instance Pfleeger fails to teach or suggest (i) at the interconnection system, detecting an attempted inter-node communication between service components (or between application components) and responsively sending the external entity *a signal indicating detection* of the attempted inter-node communication, and (ii) at the external entity, *receiving the signal* indicating detection of the attempted inter-node communication *and responsively providing* at least a portion of the access-control logic (or the access-control rules) to the interconnection system. (Emphasis added).

At best, Pfleeger teaches "[a] router has the rather simple task of receiving each packet, consulting *stored* routing tables, and passing the packet to one of several physical ports that will get the packet to its destination." (Pfleeger, pg. 429, 4th paragraph, lines 3-5, emphasis added). However, Pfleeger fails to teach or suggest an entity external to the interconnection system receiving from the interconnection system *a signal indicating detection* of an attempted inter-node communication involving the at least one service component, and *in response to receiving the signal,* the external entity providing at least a portion of the access control logic to the interconnection system, as recited in claims 1, 13, and 37.

Because Pfleeger does not teach or suggest each and every element of claims 1, 13, and 37, Pfleeger fails to anticipate claims 1, 13, and 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

- 21 -

5. Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that claims 1-21, 24, 26-28, 30-38, 42-45, and 50-53 are in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of all of the pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

MCDONNELL BOEHNEN HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP

Date: March 7, 2006

By: _David L. Ciesielski_

David L. Ciesielski
Reg. No. 57,432

- 22 -

MCDONNELL BOEHNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP
300 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE

PAGE 27/31 * RCVD AT 3/7/2006 5:09:52 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-2/10 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:+13129130002 * DURATION (mm-ss):08-02